

April 3, 1970

Dear Harold, (cc: GRS)

Your mailing of ~~4/2~~ 3/28 received.

Your 3/26: I don't know anything about the Rap Brown bombings, or dynamite in general, other than what I read in the papers. Some time ago there was talk of adding traces of radioactive elements at the point of manufacture, so that the origin could be pinpointed, and also for detection in luggage, etc. I don't think this was done, so I would assume that such analysis can't be made. The effect of an explosion below the front seat would depend somewhat on the shape and strength of the container, if any, but I would think one could tell unequivocally whether the explosive was placed in or below the car.

Re John Clifford, Dealey Plaza eyewitness (your 3/24): nothing in the index to the most likely CD's (the 14 Gemberling reports). He could be in the Charlotte files; I assume you are having the name files checked. There are 3 listings to that name in the Oakland and S.F. phone books alone.

I think you are reading too much into the Burkley file. As you may recall, I pointed out CE 1126 to you in connection with the reference to Kenney, and the possibility that Burkley may have been in part responsible for the orders to keep quiet, and for the deleting of information on the adrenals from the final report. If he was directly responsible for some of what happens, then the omission of medical information from CE 1126 may be significant. However, if he was not, there would have been no reason for him to record such material, or to observe closely - after all, the place was crawling with presumably competent doctors. He may have had no experience with forensic medicine at all. Certainly the WC should have called him - and many other people - once there were evident problems and it had been decided not to use the photos. Also, I see nothing at all inappropriate in his attention to Mrs. Kennedy or the fact or manner of his reporting it.

More or less the same goes for the Secret Service reports. Presumably there is a little distinction between the bodyguards on the Presidential detail and those who concentrate on investigative work. It is interesting that nobody goes into the hassel over the removal of the body (although how many would we expect to, i.e., how many were there at the time), but are we sure that there was such a big fuss as Manchester makes out?

The incompleteness of the file, although deplorable and all that, is hardly surprising or unique to Burkley.

The "FBI laboratory letter" referred to at CD 5.151 appears to me to be from the Lab in D.C. to the Dallas Field office; hence it would not be in the Archives. I would expect it to contain only what is reported in CD5.151.

I think all the SS statements from CD3 are in CE 1024, with others which are not in the Burkley file.

Enclosed is a copy of the NYT articles on the Ferrie archives pages. (2/24/67, p. 21; 2/25, p. 56) Sorry about the size and quality, but full-size positive copies are ridiculously expensive at the library. Note that Robertson refers to 16 (not 19) available pages, and "about 40" more withheld. "The National Archives has asked the FBI to clear those as well." Really? Ask Johnson if he did, and if so for the letter and response, if any. Could they have been "scattered through 'many thousands of pages'" and pulled together by Johnson? My copies are filed by CD, but I think they were from the Commission's Ferrie name file. (??) If Johnson had made any intelligent and systematic search for Ferrie pages he would have come up with those in CD 405, and probably CD 75, p. 1 also. Apparently Robertson did not know about the various published and unpublished SS reports, except those few in the name file.

Sincerely,

Paul

PS: Received your mailing of 4/1 (letter to Gary, etc.)
and the Phelan testimony. Many thanks.